

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/714,942	11/18/2003	Teruaki Itoh	160-397	4520	
23117 75	10/20/2004		EXAMINER		
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC			BUI, BRYAN		
1100 N GLEBE ROAD 8TH FLOOR		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-4714			2863		
			DATE MAILED: 10/20/2004	DATE MAILED: 10/20/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/714,942	ITOH, TERUAKI				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Bryan Bui	2863				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailir earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 November 2003.						
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Thi	s action is non-final.					
, , ,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	awn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) △ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) △ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. △ Certified copies of the priority document 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicationity documents have been received in Applicationity documents have been received in the process of the process	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	· (PTO-413)				
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 101304. 	Paper No(s)/Mail D					

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

With respect to claims 1 and 2, (bold statement) the phrase "a determination device configured to determine a variation of the weight of each of the processing groups of the **objects with reference to a corresponding reference value...**" is unclear. Does applicant means a comparison of the weight of each of the processing groups with a weight reference data stored in the reference memory (figure 2)?. Appropriate correction is required.

With respect to claim 5, (bold statement) the phrase "a determination device configured to determine a variation of the weight of each of the processing groups of the **objects with reference to a corresponding reference value...**" is unclear. Does applicant means a comparison of the weight of each of the processing groups with a weight reference data stored in the reference memory (figure 4)?. Further, "an adjusting/loading device configured to make weight adjustment to the groups

Art Unit: 2863

already loaded in the bucket,..." is improper. It should be—to make weight adjustment to each of the groups already loaded---(the process provide in subsequently groups, it is not totally groups). Appropriate correction is required.

The dependent claims have not been mentioned, and they are also rejected based on the rejection of the parent claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 3. Claims 1-7 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.
- 4. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Claims 1-7 are indicating allowable over the prior art of record (when they overcome the 112 rejection as set forth above) because the prior art does not disclose the claimed combination as recited in the claims. The combination of the Background/Related arts of the invention in the current application and the references cited (specially ref No. 3,679,130) discloses container holding rotatable body with adjustable balancing feature including means for balancing weight with respect to the axis of rotation of the centrifuge by mechanism does not suggest the claimed combination as recited.

Conclusion

 The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Application/Control Number: 10/714,942 Page 4

Art Unit: 2863

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bryan Bui whose telephone number is 571-272-2271. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th from 7am-4pm, and Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Barlow can be reached on 571-272-2269. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BRYAN BUI PRIMARY EXAMINER

BB

10/13/2004